



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,104	12/21/2001	Charles J. Litty	G09.001	7506
67338	7590	02/25/2008		
BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF & TALWALKAR, LLC			EXAMINER	
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY			AKINTOLA, OLABODE	
50 LOCUST AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840			3691	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/026,104	LITTY, CHARLES J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	OLABODE AKINTOLA	3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date, _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Invention I (claims 1-12) in the reply filed on 1/15/2008 is acknowledged. Claims 13-14 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over Munoz et al (US 20020198819) in view of Zoffel et al (US 5274547).

Re claims 1, 4-12: Munoz teaches a method for facilitating analysis of commercial credit customers, comprising: selecting, based on the first customer information, a first risk model appropriate to apply to the first customer information, the first risk model being selected from a plurality of available risk models (sections 0003, 0039: Equifax, Experian or Trans Union); generating first risk information associated with the first customer by applying the first risk model to the first customer information (section 0003, 0039: FICO scores); selecting, based on the second customer information, a second risk model appropriate to apply to the second customer information, the second risk model being selected from a plurality of available risk models (sections 0003, 0039: Equifax, Experian or Trans Union); and generating second risk information associated with the second customer by applying the second risk model to the second customer information, wherein the second risk model is different than the first risk model (section 0003, 0039: FICO scores).

Munoz does not explicitly teach determining first customer information associated with a first commercial credit customer, at least some of the first customer information being based on a first plurality of commercial credit accounts associated with the first customer; and determining second customer information associated with a second commercial credit customer, different than the first customer, at least some of the second customer information being based on a second plurality of commercial credit accounts associated with the second customer.

However, Zoffel in the same field of endeavor, teaches determining first customer information associated with a first commercial credit customer, at least some of the first customer information being based on a first plurality of commercial credit accounts associated with the first customer; and determining second customer information associated with a second

commercial credit customer, different than the first customer, at least some of the second customer information being based on a second plurality of commercial credit accounts associated with the second customer (col. 19, lines 1 through col. 20, lines 52: credit report). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these steps as taught by Zoffel to Munoz because the risk models (Equifax, Experian or Trans Union) contain information associated with the customer including information based on plurality of credit accounts associated with the customers (revolving, installment, line of credit or mortgage).

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over Munoz in view of Zoffel and further in view of Basch et al (US 6119103).

Re claims 2-3: Munoz does not explicitly teach generating a list of high risk customers based on at the least the first and second risk information; and periodically transmitting information associated with the list to a risk manager via a communication network. Basch teaches these limitations at col. 5, lines 29-54. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Munoz to include this feature for the obvious reason of protecting the credit line.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olabode Akintola whose telephone number is 571-272-3629. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OA

/Hani M. Kazimi/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691